



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,354	01/30/2001	Paul J. Rank	30014200.1080/PJLM	2393
58328	7590	07/23/2007		
SUN MICROSYSTEMS C/O SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

MAILED

Application Number: 09/774,354
Filing Date: January 30, 2001
Appellant(s): RANK ET AL.

JUL 23 2007

Technology Center 2100

Wesly Ferrebee

For Appellant(s)

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 09/06/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/23/2005.

1. Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or having a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

3. Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

4. Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

5. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection is correct.

7. Claims Appendix

The copy of the appeal claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

8. Evidence Relied Upon

The following is listing of the evidence relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal:

- Schlafly U.S. 5,471,612 November 28, 1995
- Horie et al. U.S. 6,487,597 November 26, 2002

9. Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Horie et al.** (U.S. 6,487,597) in view of **Schlafly** (U.S. 5,471,612).

As to claim 1:

Horie teaches a method in a data processing system for evaluating a spreadsheet file (*e.g., a personal digital assistant and an information transmission apparatus for use with the personal digital assistant capable of displaying data, for example, in texts or spreadsheets; col.1, lines 8-14; see Fig.10 and the spreadsheet processing discussion,*

col.9, lines 10-59; see also Figs.18-21 and the transfer of spreadsheet data discussion, col.11, lines 1-28) comprising:

- *obtaining (e.g., are open) the spreadsheet file (e.g., spreadsheet) in a first format (e.g., FIG. 18 shows the spreadsheet including 7 records displayed in 7 rows (1-7), each record has 6 attributes (A-F) = the first format of the spreadsheet) on a first device (e.g., the personal computer 10) [Transfer of Spreadsheet Data - FIG. 18 shows a display screen 30 of the personal computer 10. On the display screen 30, an application program 31 (spreadsheet program in this example) and the GU interface 24a of the data communication program 20 are open; col.11, lines 1-6];*
- *converting (e.g., an "S" command button 24f of the GU interface 24a is clicked to change the first format of the spreadsheet (as displayed in FIG. 18) to a second format (as displayed in FIG. 21)) the spreadsheet file to a second format (e.g., FIG. 19 shows a portion of the spreadsheet is selected for creating/changing to a second format (including 5 records displayed in 5 rows (1-5), each record is now included 4 attributes (A-D); and FIG. 21 shows the spreadsheet displayed in the PDA 13 with the second format) [Transfer of Spreadsheet Data - Now, as shown in FIG. 19, when the application program 31 is set as an active window and the range of any particular portion of a plurality of cells is specified with a mouse, the cells in the range are displayed in an inverted manner, as shown. When an "S" command button 24f of the GU interface 24a is clicked in this state, the data communication program (FIGS. 7 or 11) is executed, and the string of characters*

within the cells of the specified range is transmitted to the PDA 13; col.11, lines 1-28]; and

- *transferring (e.g., transfer/ is transmitted) the spreadsheet file to a second device (e.g., to the PDA) [Transfer of Spreadsheet Data... the data communication program (FIGS. 7 or 11) is executed, and the string of characters within the cells of the specified range is transmitted to the PDA 13... when the range of desired ones of a large amount of data is specified which is acquired and specified by any particular one of various kinds of programs on an information transmission apparatus (personal computer or the like), it is transmitted as a new file to the personal digital assistant. The personal digital assistant can receive the file, store it in a predetermined data area, use the file data and display the content of the file; col.11, lines 1-37].*

Horie does teach converting a spreadsheet file form a first format to a second format.

Horie, however, does not specifically teach “*evaluating one or more formulas associated with the spreadsheet file while converting.*”

Schlaflly teaches evaluating one or more formulas (e.g., *The Formula Evaluator 136 processes the various formulas stored in a spreadsheet during spreadsheet recalculation; col. 7, lines 34-40).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Horie with Schlafly because Schlafly's teaching would have provided the enhanced capability for promoting the sharing of information between the personal computer 10 and the personal digital assistant 13 (*see Horie; col.7, lines 22-37*).

As to claim 2:

Horie teaches the first device is a computer (*e.g., a personal computer 10; col.4, lines 1-2 & Fig.1*).

As to claim 3:

Horie teaches the second device is a small device (*e.g., PDA 13; col.4, line 5 and Fig.1*).

As to claim 4:

Horie teaches the small device is a PDA (*e.g., PDA 13; col.4, line 5 and Fig.1*).

As to claims 10-13:

Note the rejection of claims 1-4 above. Claims 10-13 are the same as claims 1-4, except claims 10-13 are computer program product claims and claims 1-4 are method claims.

Claims 5-9 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wright et al.** in view of **Schlaflly** as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of **Pajakowski et al** (U.S. 6,718,425 – field 05/2000).

As to claim 5:

The combination of Horie and Schlaflly does teach converting a spreadsheet file form a first format to a second format. The combination, however, does not specifically teach the use of a conduit.

Pajakowski teaches the use of a conduit (*e.g., conduit software ... to convert; col.46, lines 55-64*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pajakowski with Horie as modified by Schlaflly because Pajakowski's teaching would have provided the enhanced capability for translating and moving data from the personal computer 10 and the personal digital assistant 13.

As to claim 6:

Horie does not specifically teach "gathering the one or more formulas."

Schlaflly teaches gathering the one or more formulas (*col.15, lines 1-30*).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Horie with Schlafly because Schlafly's teaching would have provided the capability for improving the speed with which electronic spreadsheets perform recalculation of spreadsheets.

As to claim 7:

Horie does not specifically teach "evaluating the formulas by the conduit."

Schlafly teaches evaluating the formulas (*e.g., Formula Evaluator ... compiling spreadsheet formulas; Abstract*). Schlafly, however, does not specifically teach the use of conduit.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Horie with Schlafly because it would have increased the speed of transmission of the spreadsheet from the personal computer to the personal digital assistant.

Refer to discussion of claim 5 above for rejection regarding to the use of a conduit.

As to claim 8:

Horie teaches compiling code that is readable by a small device (*col. 7, lines 36-52*).

As to claim 9:

Horie does not specifically teach "parsing the formulas."

Schlaflly teaches parsing the formulas (*see Abstract*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Horie with Schlaflly because Schlaflly's teaching would have provided the enhanced capability for promoting the sharing of information between the personal computer 10 and the personal digital assistant 13 (*see Horie; col.7, lines 22-37*).

As to claims 14-18:

Note the rejection of claims 5-9 above. Claims 14-18 are the same as claims 5-9, except claims 10-13 are computer program product claims and claims 5-9 are method claims.

10. Response to Arguments

Beginning on page 5 of the brief, Appellants argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below:

- a. Appellants argued that the combination of Horie and Schlafly does not teach
"converting the spreadsheet file to a second format wherein the converting further comprises evaluating one or more formulas associated with the spreadsheet file while converting the spreadsheet file to the second format
[Argument, page 5].

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellants. As detailed in the rejection of claim 1 as clarified above, Horie discloses converting (e.g., an "S" command button 24f of the GU interface 24a is clicked to change the first format of the spreadsheet (as displayed in FIG. 18) to a second format (as displayed in FIG. 21) the spreadsheet file to a second format (e.g., FIG. 19 shows a portion of the spreadsheet is selected for creating/changing to a second format (including 5 records displayed in 5 rows (1-5), each record is now included 4 attributes (A-D); and FIG. 21 shows the spreadsheet displayed in the PDA 13 with the second format) [Transfer of Spreadsheet Data - Now, as shown in FIG. 19, when the application program 31 is set as an active window and the range of any particular portion of a plurality of cells is specified with a mouse, the cells in the range are displayed in an inverted manner, as shown. When an "S" command button 24f of the GU interface 24a is clicked in this state, the data communication program (FIGS. 7 or 11) is executed, and the string of characters within the cells of the specified range is transmitted to the PDA 13; col.11, lines 1-28]. Schlafly is combined with Horie to teach evaluating one or more formulas associated with

the spreadsheet file while converting the spreadsheet file to the second format
*e.g., The Formula Evaluator 136 processes the various formulas stored in a
spreadsheet during spreadsheet recalculation; col. 7, lines 34-40).*

- b. Appellants recited col.2, lines 60-67 and col.4, lines 1-10 in Schlafly which state:

Before meaningful results of a given spreadsheet may be presented to a user, the formulas of a given spreadsheet must first be evaluated or recalculated. "Recalculation" is the process by which a spreadsheet's cells, particularly formula-storing ones, are evaluated to express values. Different recalculation orders are well known including, for instance, natural, rowwise, and columnwise. Each will be reviewed in turn.

*...
The present invention comprises an electronic spreadsheet system having a preferred interface and methods for compiling spreadsheet formulas into native machine instructions. The system includes a Formula Evaluator for compiling a given spreadsheet formula into a machine language sequence to be executed by the target processor/coprocessor. In this manner, the system may perform recalculation of spreadsheet formulas in substantially less time than is required by prior art, token-based interpreter systems.*

and argued that "[S]ee column 4, lines 1-10 of Schlafly. Thus, Schlafly indicates that formula evaluation is performed after compilation or conversion. By converting the formula prior to evaluation, evaluation or recalculation may be performed more quickly. Accordingly, Schlafly does not teach or suggest converting while evaluating" [Argument, page 5].

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellants. The above cited portions shows Schlafly does not indicate that formula evaluation is performed after compilation or conversion. In fact, Schlafly teaches converting while evaluating.

- c. Appellant argued that Horie fails to teach or suggest the “*while*’ limitation [Argument, page 5].

In response, as detailed in the rejection of claim 1 as clarified above, Schlafly is combined with Horie to teach evaluating while converting (e.g., *The Formula Evaluator 136 processes the various formulas stored in a spreadsheet during spreadsheet recalculation; col. 7, lines 34-40*).

- d. Appellants argued “[N]owhere does Horie suggest that anything other than conversion is performed during the conversion process. Thus, Horie also cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest that formula evaluation is performed while converting the spreadsheet file” [Argument, page 6].

In response, the rejection of claim 1 as clarified above shows how the combination of Horie and Schlafly meet the claim limitations.

- e. Appellants argued that “[T]here Is No Motivation To Combine the Cited References” [Argument, page 7].

In response, the rejection of claim 1 above is modified to clarify the rejection and provide a proper motivation for combining the references.

11. Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.


Maikhanh Nguyen

Respectfully submitted,


WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Conferees:


Heather Herndon


Stephen Hong

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
8000 Sears Tower
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080